

unpatentable over Henshaw et al. in view of Hopfeld, and claims 29-30 as being unpatentable over Henshaw et al. in view of Mahoney et al.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.


Figure 2 of Henshaw et al. illustrates two spaced cavities in an I-beam 11. The mass center of the I-beam appears to be located between these two cavities. That is, the mass center of the I-beam is not located in the middle of either cavity; neither cavity is "concentric" about the mass center of the I-beam. Indeed, using the definition of "concentric" provided by the Examiner, the I-beam does not have a common center with either of the cavities.

In contrast, cavity 2a of Figure 1 of the instant specification is concentric about the mass center of the blank 1. (It is noted that cavities 2 illustrated in Figure 1 are not concentric about the mass center of the blank 1.) Thus, the language in independent claims 14 and 20 (renumbered) set forth in the Preliminary Amendment of March 21, 2002 requiring at least one cavity that has an inner surface at a distance from the mass center of the blank and is arranged concentrically about said mass center is illustrated as cavity 2a in Figure 1. Henshaw et al. simply does not disclose or suggest such a cavity. The two cavities in Henshaw et al. are spaced from the mass center, and are analogous to cavities 2 of Figure 1 of the instant specification. Neither of the two cavities in Henshaw et al. has a common center with the mass center of the I-beam. Neither is concentric about the mass center.

Hopfeld and Mahoney do not supply this deficiency of Henshaw et al.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
176 E. Main Street
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581
TEL: (508) 898-1818